

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 003

CG 017 370

AUTHOR Hanlon, Martin D.
TITLE Age and the Commitment to Work.
PUB DATE 20 Nov 83
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society (36th, San Francisco, CA, November 17-22, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; *Employees; Employment; *Job Satisfaction; *Predictor Variables; Prestige; Work Attitudes; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Commitment; Job Involvement

ABSTRACT

Although age and work commitment have been correlated positively in previous studies, the studies have not clearly defined whether it is age per se or the correlates of age (job tenure, length of service) which account for the commitment. To investigate the relationship between age and various indicators of commitment to work (job involvement, work role, noneconomic orientation to work, and work effort) among a nationally representative sample of the adult working population in the United States, data from 1,311 nonfarm wage and salary employees from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, were analyzed. Dimensions of work commitment and the predictor variables of sex, job tenure, income, education, age, and occupational prestige were considered. The results showed that older workers were indeed more committed to their jobs than were their younger counterparts, although the differences between age groups were small. However, within the multivariate framework, age had little independent effect on work commitment. For work role involvement, older workers below retirement age scored significantly lower than younger workers. Workers beyond retirement age scored relatively high on work role involvement, suggesting that this group of workers was highly motivated. Both job satisfaction and occupational prestige were strong predictors of work commitment. The data suggest that those who view increased work commitment as a policy goal should focus on a means to improve job satisfaction.
(Author/BL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED243003

AGE AND THE COMMITMENT TO WORK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martin D. Hanlon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Martin D. Hanlon
Department of Urban Studies
Queens College of the City
University of New York
Flushing, NY 11367

Paper prepared for the 36th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological
Society of America. San Francisco. November 20, 1983

CG 017370

Previous research has found a consistent, positive relationship between age and work commitment. However, it is not clear if it is age per se or correlates of age, such as job tenure or length of service within the firm, that account for observed gains in work commitment over the life cycle. This study examines this question in detail. I present the results of a multivariate analysis of data from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey--a large representative probability sample of the U.S. workforce. I assess the impact of age and several other factors on work commitment. Four separate work commitment measures are used including a short form of the well-known Job Involvement Scale. The data indicate that older workers are indeed more committed to their jobs than are their younger counterparts, although the differences between age groups are small. Within a multivariate framework, however, age has little independent effect on work commitment. Job satisfaction and occupational prestige did, however.

The findings of this study bear upon much recent speculation about the decline of the "work ethic" among young workers in the United States. They indicate that in and of itself, age doesn't seem to matter.

Over the past several years, many have speculated about a decline in work commitment in the United States (See, for example: Sheppard & Herrick, 1972; HEW Task Force, 1973; Hedges, 1983). Often, the emphasis is on age group differences. Theory holds that younger workers, unlike their elders, seldom view work as an obligation or a moral duty; rather commitment to work is conditional upon how well the job or the work environment meets personal needs. The purported age gap in work commitment reflects the growth of what Yankelovich (1979) calls the "psychology of entitlement." The higher educational attainment of younger age cohorts create expectations of greater autonomy and self-fulfillment in work--expectations that often cannot be met within present-day work organizations. Moreover, the climate of affluence that has marked the post-World War II period (until recently, at least) has undermined the sense of economic insecurity that fueled the work commitment of earlier generations. This perspective also implies age-related differences in the impact of organizational climate and reward structures on work commitment. Since older workers are more likely to view work as a calling than are younger workers, they are relatively insensitive to variations in the quality of the work environment.

These are important and challenging issues that command serious research attention. Unfortunately, the validity of much of the existing research on commitment to work is limited by the fact that the construct lacks a clearly defined realm of meaning. Also, most of the studies that have measured work commitment have been carried out with small, often idiosyncratic samples; few claims can be made for the external validity of findings. Moreover, the majority of research studies on the determinants of work commitment have used correlational rather than multivariate procedures, with consequent limits to internal validity.

The purpose of this study, which is based on data from a large national probability sample, is to clarify the relationship between age and the commitment to work. First, the literature on the measurement of commitment to work will be discussed. This will be followed by a review of existing studies reporting age differences in work commitment. Then, the methods and findings of the present study will be reported. Finally, the significance of the study and directions for future research will be discussed.

Measuring Commitment to Work

Lodahl and Kejner's Job Involvement scale, first presented in 1965, remains the most widely used measure of the commitment to work. Lodahl and Kejner define job involvement as "the degree to which a person's work performance (affects) his self esteem" (1965, p. 25). It is an enduring "value orientation toward work that is learned early in the socialization process" (p. 25). By implication, job involvement is relatively unaffected by the nature of the job or changes in the work environment. Since its original formulation, several researchers have explored further the psychological meaning of job involvement. Reitz and Jewell define job involvement as "the degree to which one's work is an important part of his or her life" (1979, p. 72). Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, citing Lodahl and Kejner (1965) assert that job involvement "concerns an individual's ego involvement with the job, i.e., the degree to which his self esteem is affected by his work performance" (1978, p. 384). In their often cited article on the topic, Lawler and Hall (1970) define job involvement as:

The degree to which a person's total work situation is an important part of his life. The job-involved person is one who is affected very much personally by his job situation (pp. 310-311).

There are several etiological perspectives on job involvement--many of which are summarized in Rabinowitz and Hall's (1977) review of the organizational research literature on job involvement. As noted, Lodahl and Kejner see job involvement as primarily an individual characteristic. Other theorists, however, hold that while individual differences cannot be ignored, situational determinants are more important: that is, job involvement is essentially an attitude that is shaped by the socio-technical parameters of the work organization (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977, pp. 268-9). A third perspective views job involvement as the product of individual-situation interaction (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977, p. 269).

The dimensionality of job involvement is another open question. In Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) original study, the twenty items that comprise the global job involvement scale loaded on five separate factors (pp. 27-28). Schwyhart and Smith (1972), however, found a high degree of internal consistency among the twenty items, indicating a single underlying factor. Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979) identify two separate constructs within the Lodahl and Kejner items. One labelled work involvement is "the extent to which a person wants to be engaged in work (p. 130)." The other, intrinsic job motivation, concerns "a person's present job and the extent to which he wants to perform well in that job (p. 130)." The authors develop scales for each of the two constructs. In a recent study, Kanungo (1982) describes the "excess meanings" of the term, job involvement. Using a large, diverse Canadian sample, he attempts to develop valid and reliable measures of job and work involvement. According to Kanungo:

The former is a belief descriptive of the present job and tends to be a function of how much the job can satisfy one's present needs. But involvement with work in general or the centrality of work in one's life is a normative belief about the value of work in one's life, and is more a function of one's past cultural conditioning or socialization (p. 342).

Kanungo's work is perhaps the most sophisticated attempt to clarify the meaning of job involvement and related constructs. Hopefully, replications will follow.

The relationship between job involvement and other work attitudes has been the subject of several investigations. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld reported significant correlations between job involvement and several dimensions of motivator (or intrinsic) job satisfaction (1968, p. 471). Schwyhart and Smith (1972) reported a positive relationship between job involvement and company satisfaction. Lawler and Hall (1970) concluded on the basis of a factor analysis that job involvement, intrinsic motivation attitudes, and higher order need satisfaction attitudes are related but are, nevertheless, empirically distinct. Summarizing their results, Lawler and Hall state that:

In brief, job involvement may be thought of as the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his identify. Intrinsic motivation can be thought of as the degree to which attaining higher order need satisfaction depends on performance, and satisfaction as the degree to which the needs are actually satisfied. (1970, p. 311)

In a subsequent replication of the Lawler and Hall study, Cummings and Bigelow (1976) confirmed the factorial separateness of these three concepts. Later, in a study that was carefully designed to explore the dimensionality of job involvement, Saleh and Hosek (1976) factor analyzed a pool of 65 items drawn from previous studies. Three principal factors emerged--factors that were empirically similar to those identified by Lawler and Hall (1970) as measures of job involvement, job satisfaction, and need satisfaction. But while Lawler and Hall emphasized the separateness of these concepts, Saleh and Hosek contend that

...an important common element exists between them.
 ...the common element is the self or the self concept
 and the three factors express its different dimensions.
 (1976, p. 222)

Thus, conceptual differences remain even when there is empirical agreement.

Assessing the validity of these multiple perspectives is beyond the scope of this paper. But it is fair to conclude that within the literature as a whole, there is little common agreement on what the Job Involvement scale or subsets of items from the scale actually measure or on the relationship of job involvement to other work-related attitudes.

Moreover, job involvement is but one of several constructs for gauging commitment to work. In an often-cited early paper, Dubin (1956) defined the concept of "central life interest" and found that for the majority of those in his sample of industrial workers, family and leisure time activities were more important than work. Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) described the involved worker as one whose self esteem is tied to level of performance on the job--a theme that is addressed in later research on job involvement. Blood (1969) constructed a scale intended to measure adherence to the tenets of the Protestant Ethic. Blood found that persons who ascribe to Protestant Ethic ideals and disagree with statements rejecting the Protestant Ethic reported relatively high levels of satisfaction on several subscales of Smith, Kendall and Hulin's (1969) Job Description Index. In a replication using the Blood measure, Aldag and Brief reported a positive relationship between support of Protestant Ethic ideals and higher order need strength (1975, p. 759).

A number of studies utilize multiple measures of work commitment. Those of Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979) and Kanungo (1982) are described above. Taylor and Thompson (1976) formulated a "work value systems questionnaire." Factor

analysis of data from a large sample of young workers yielded five separate value dimensions, including pride in work, need for self expression in work, and "ecosystem distrust" (p. 528). In a study of the work values of older workers, Cherrington, Condie, and England derive six separate scales: the moral importance of work, pride in craftsmanship, upward striving, importance of money, importance of friends over work, and acceptability of welfare (1979, pp. 620-622).

In summary, there are numerous measures of commitment to work. Some, notably, the Job Involvement and the Protestant Ethic scales, have been used in a variety of studies and have some established claim to reliability and validity. (The conceptual and empirical relationship between these two particular measures is not clear, however). Other measures have been developed and used on a more ad hoc basis. As a group, these measures tap conceptual domains that are distinct from that of job satisfaction but given the differences in the meaning and content of these measures and wide variations in the nature of the samples used, it is difficult to make statements about their relative validity as indicators of commitment to work.

The definition of commitment to work used in this study is an amalgam of key dimensions from previous research. The committed worker, viewed as an ideal type, can be described as follows: he or she sees the job as the central focus of life and as an important source of self-esteem. The nature of the work itself is more important to the person than the economic rewards derived from the job. The committed worker puts in much more effort into the job than is required and would continue to work in the absence of economic necessity.

Age and Work Commitment

Turning now to the relationship between age and work commitment: Table 1 presents findings from eighteen located studies that have been published over the past three decades. (Some studies included more than one sample.) In most of the studies, age is not a variable of theoretical interest but, rather, one of a number of socio-demographic correlates of the work value being measured. The Lodahl and Kejner Job Involvement scale or subsets of items from the scale were used in eleven of the eighteen studies.

Table 1. about here

Despite the diversity of measures and study samples, there is a generally consistent positive relationship between age and work commitment. Older workers seem to adhere to "traditional" work values to a greater extent than younger workers. Older workers report significantly higher job involvement in twelve of the seventeen samples in which the full twenty item Lodahl and Kejner scale or subsets of items from it are used.

As indicated earlier, there are important methodological limitations in many of these studies that compromise their validity. Some are based on samples that make no claim to being representative of a known population. In most, the sample is relatively small and intentionally homogeneous. As noted, in most studies, analysis is confined to zero-order relationships between work commitment and several variables, including age, that are assumed to be determinants of work commitment. Since age is likely to

covary with such potential determinants of work commitment as job tenure or income, observed relationships between age and work commitment may be spurious.

Objectives of the Present Study

This study is intended to assess the relationship between age and commitment to work and to overcome some of the limitations of previous research. It tests the specific hypothesis that older workers are more committed to work than younger workers. In contrast to much of the previously cited work in which the representativeness of the sample is often questionable, this study is based on a large national probability sample, representative of the adult working population of the United States. A multivariate analysis strategy was adopted in order to examine the relationship between age and work commitment while controlling for the correlates of age. Taking into account the lack of agreement on the dimensions of commitment to work, several indicators of the construct were used.

METHOD

Sample

The data source for this study is the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, carried out by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan and sponsored by several divisions within the U.S. Department of Labor.¹ Using a multistage-area probability sample covering the 48 coterminous U.S. states, interviews were conducted with 1515 individuals 16 years or older who were currently employed for pay for 20 or more hours per week. Only one eligible respondent per selected household was interviewed. The overall response rate was 73.4 percent. The demographic and occupational distributions of the Quality of Employment sample correspond closely to reported Current Population Survey data gathered at about the same time.² The analysis presented here is limited to the 1311 nonfarm wage and salary employees in the sample.

Measures

Eight items identical or similar to items used in commitment to work studies described in Table 1 were included in the Quality of Employment Survey. The eight items are listed in Appendix A. Factor analysis yielded four separate dimensions.³ Each will be described below.

Job Involvement (JI) was measured by three Quality of Employment Survey items drawn from the original Lodahl and Kejner (1965) global Job Involvement scale. Two of the items--one of which reads: "My main satisfaction in life comes from my work"--are part of the six-item subset that has been used frequently used in subsequent research. The internal reliability, measured by Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Nunnally, 1978) over the total sample was .56.

Work Role Involvement (WRI) was measured by a two-item scale. One item, "If you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you'd like for the rest of your life, would you continue to work?" is similar to an item initially used in a study by Morse and Weiss (1955) and later incorporated into the Lodahl and Kejner twenty-item scale. In the present sample the scale reliability (coefficient α) was .53.

Non-Economic Orientation to Work (NEO) was measured with a two-item scale. One item, "My main interest in work is to get enough money to do the other things I want" is similar to a component item of Blood's (1969) Pro-Protestant Ethic Scale. The scale reliability here was .60.

Work Effort (WE) was measured by a single item in which the respondent was asked to indicate how much effort he or she put into the job beyond what was required.

The internal reliability of all three scales is quite modest. The use of these three short scales and the single item measure raises an issue that is often present in research using large national probability samples--the trade-off between representativeness and the need to restrict the number of items used to measure each of the large number of constructs used in the questionnaire. Economy constraints often entail sacrificing reliability by incorporating subsets of items rather than the full "parent" measures. In the analysis, this has the effect of attenuating the true relationships among variables. In the present case, it was felt that the obvious strengths of sample size and representativeness outweighed threats to internal validity posed by the modest scale coefficients.

The correlations between the four commitment to work measures are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

The intercorrelations among the four commitment to work measures range from low to moderate, indicating that they represent separate empirical domains. The four measures will be used as separate dependent variables in the multivariate analysis which follows.

Variables used as predictors of the four commitment to work measures were selected on the basis of their theoretical relevance and usage in previous research. Included were: sex of respondent, coded as a dummy variable with men scored 1 and women scored 0; length of job tenure in years; income, education, age and occupational prestige. The latter was adopted from the Hodge, Siegel and Rossi Prestige scale (Siegel, 1971). In addition, the measure of "facet-free" job satisfaction derived from the Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn & Staines, 1979) was included. The internal consistency of this scale (coefficient α) was .77 in the present sample.

An inherent problem in multivariate analyses in non-experimental situations is that of measurement biases due to correlations among independent variables. In the present study one could expect, on common sense grounds, to find a relationship between age and job tenure (seniority), or between income and education. Since strong correlations among predictor variables can lead to misleading parameter estimates (Gordon, 1968) it is important to examine the pattern of relationships. In Table 3, the matrix of correlations for the full set of independent variables is presented.

Table 3 about here

The zero-order correlations in Table 3 range from extremely weak to strong. None approach a level where multicollinearity is an obvious problem, although it cannot be ruled out entirely.

Data Analysis

If older workers are more committed to the work role than younger workers, it is important to understand why this is so. The essential question is whether age in itself affects work commitment or whether it is age-related factors such as seniority that are important. For example: high seniority employees may be more committed to the organization than those with limited tenure. Commitment to or psychological identification with the work organization may in turn generalize to a more abstract commitment to work. Following a similar inferential path, some theorists who maintain that the work values of contemporary younger workers are substantially different from those of older workers focus on the corrosive effects of education. Older workers are more committed to work because their modest educational attainment limits discontent.

Much of the previous empirical research on work commitment is correlational in nature and there have been few attempts to separate the influence of age from that of its correlates. Ideally, the problem should be addressed by means of a long-term longitudinal study in which age, career, and organizational influences are carefully disaggregated. No such data source exists. An alternative is to statistically control for

the covariates of age and observe if a relationship between age and work commitment remains once the effects of these variables are removed. This is the procedure adopted here.

Specifically, a multi-stage hierarchical regression procedure was used (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). First, five of the seven independent variables included in the analysis--sex, job tenure or seniority, income, education, and occupational prestige--were regressed on the four measures of work commitment and a coefficient of determination (R^2) was computed for each. At the second stage, the measure of job satisfaction was included in each of the regressions along with the initial array of the five independent variables. At the third stage, each of the dependent variables was regressed on all seven independent variables, including age. At the second and third stage, the coefficient of determination was compared with that of the previous stage. An F test was used to measure the statistical significance of the squared semipartial correlation of the added variable. Substantively, the procedure assays the independent contribution of job satisfaction and age on commitment to work after the effects of demographic and organizational correlates have been removed. While age is the central variable of interest here, job satisfaction was accorded separate attention since a great deal of previous research has focused on the close (and problematic) relationship between job satisfaction and work commitment.

RESULTS

Mean scores for the four commitment to work measures by age group are presented in Table 4. In all cases, higher scores indicate higher levels of work commitment. The boundaries of the age groups were arbitrarily

determined, although the age distribution of the present sample and groupings used in previous studies were taken into consideration. For the measure of Work Role Involvement, older workers were divided into two groups--those between 55 and 64 years and the much smaller group of workers 65 and over. Items in this measure top commitment to work in the absence of economic necessity; one could assume they would have different meanings for those who are presently eligible for government and private retirement benefits in comparison with those who are not.

Table 4 about here

As indicated by the data in Table 4, there is a positive relationship between age and job involvement. Older workers (45 and above) score significantly higher than younger workers on the Job Involvement scale. This finding is consistent with previous research. However, the mean score differences between age categories are relatively modest.

For Work Role Involvement, the pattern of results is different. Here, older workers below retirement age score significantly lower than younger workers. But workers who are beyond retirement age score relatively high on work role involvement--a finding that is consistent with the hypothesis that people who continue to work after 65 are a self-selected highly motivated group. The subsample of post-retirement age workers is very small, however ($n = 22$). For non-economic orientation to work and work effort, there are no consistent linear age patterns, although younger workers score lowest on both measures.

These bivariate relationships, while suggestive, do not allow for an assessment of the net relationship between age and commitment to work once the influence of age correlates is taken into account. This is the purpose of the hierarchical regression model adopted here, the results of which are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 about here

The multivariate analysis indicates that age has no independent effect on three of the four commitment to work measures included in this study. The positive relationship found between age and job involvement in the bivariate case disappears when the set of control variables is included. Only for work role involvement does age make a significant contribution to R^2 net of the other demographic and work-related variables included in the analysis. But as in the bivariate case, the influence of age is negative. This finding is similar to that of the early Morse & Weiss (1955) study.⁴

In contrast to age, job satisfaction emerged as a strong factor in predicting commitment to work for three of the four measures--job involvement, non-economic orientation toward work, and level of work effort. The results of the regression on job involvement are consistent with the findings of previous correlational studies which reported a significant relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Gannon & Hendrikson, 1973). However, none of these research studies, including the present one, rule out possible reciprocal efforts between the two variables.

Examination of the standardized regression coefficients reveals that occupational prestige is statistically significant for all four measures. Thus, prestige as well as job satisfaction emerge as consistent predictors of commitment to work. Beyond this, no general pattern is evident. Men scored significantly higher than women on job involvement and work role involvement, while women scored higher on work effort. Interestingly, when considered net of all other factors, income shows a negative relationship with work-role involvement and non-economic orientation to work. This implies that high income acts as a disincentive to work commitment. In contrast, education was a significant, positive prediction of work role involvement and non-economic orientation to work.

It is also apparent that there are substantial differences in the amount of variance explained by the full set of predictor variables among the four commitment to work measures. The squared multiple correlation ranges from 3.8 percent in the case of work effort to 23.8 percent for the measure of non-economic orientation to work. Since the reliability coefficients for the three scale measure were roughly similar, it is unlikely that these differences in R^2 can be explained by differential attenuation. Looking at these results in another way; the low coefficients of determination for three of the four commitment to work measures are consistent with the generally modest relationships found between work attitudes and demographic variables. Apart from non-economic orientation to work, commitment to work is largely a function of unknown possibly idiosyncratic factors.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between age and commitment to work. Using a large national probability sample representative

of the U.S. work force, a hierarchical regression procedure was used to measure the impact of age on four measures of work commitment over and above the effects of the covariates of age. For three of the four measures, age made no independent contribution to the prediction of the level of work commitment. In the singular case of Work Role Involvement, the effect of age, for workers under 65, was negative.

Several limitations of this study should be noted. First, the measures of commitment to work used were short item sets drawn from previously constructed measures. Several of these items have been shown to have high loadings on the parent measure in previous studies; nonetheless the content validity of the items used in this study has not been established. Also, the relatively low reliabilities of the three scales and the use of a single item measure may have led to attenuation-related underestimates of the influence of the independent variables, including age, on work commitment. However, it's not likely that correcting for attenuation at the level of zero-order correlations before the multiple correlations were computed would make much of a difference.

In common with all previous related work, this study relies upon a cross sectional data base. Unfortunately, this makes it difficult to explore the meaning of age in any precise, analytic fashion. It is, for example, all but impossible to separate maturational and cohort effects in a cross sectional study. Put in a general way: do workers' attitudes change as they age or are age-related differences in attitudes accounted for by the unique historical experience of different age groups? This question was not a serious empirical issue here in that age differences mattered little. Still, the point to be made is that chronological age represents a crude

proxy for many important and interesting social processes that can only be approached through a long-range longitudinal research study.

The marginal importance of age in predicting levels of work commitment is the major finding of this study. The data here lead one to be skeptical of assertions that work commitment has significantly declined among younger workers. The data also suggest that those who view increasing work commitment as a policy goal should focus on means of improving job satisfaction. In turn, a more careful specification of the relationship between satisfaction and commitment should be an objective of future research.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹The data for this study were made available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The principal investigators of the study were Robert Quinn and Graham Staines. Full responsibility for the analysis and interpretations presented in this report rest with the author.
- ²A full description of sample design and sampling error estimates is provided in Quinn and Staines (1979, pp. 1-32).
- ³The factor analysis is similar to that reported by Quinn and Staines (1979). Results are available from the author.
- ⁴Workers over 65 were not included in this regression because of the small size of this group (N = 22) and differences in the response patterns of this group and the much larger group of older, pre-retirement age workers (N = 163).

REFERENCES

1. Aldag, R.J., & Brief, A.P. Age, work values and employee reactions. Industrial Gerontology, 1977, 4, 192-197.
2. Aldag, R.J., & Brief, A.P. Some correlates of work values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 757-760.
3. Blood, M.R. Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 456-459.
4. Blumberg, M. Job switching in autonomous work groups: An exploratory study in a Pennsylvania coal mine. Academy of Management Journal, 1980, 23, 287-206.
5. Cherrington, D.J., Condie, S.J., & England, J.L. Age and work values. Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 617-623.
6. Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1975.
7. Cummings, T.G., & Bigelow, J. Satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation: An extension of Lawler and Hall's factor analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 523-525.
8. Dubin, R. Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the 'central life interests' of industrial workers. Social Problems, 1956, 3, 131-142.
9. Gannon, M.J., & Hendrickson, D.H. Career orientation and job satisfaction among working wives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 339-340.
10. Gordon, R.A. Issues in multiple regression. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 592-616.
11. Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
12. Hall, D.T., & Mansfeld, R. Relationships of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 201-210.
13. Hammer, T.H., Landau, J.C., & Stern, R.N. Absenteeism when workers have a voice: The case of employee ownership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1981, 66, 561-573.
14. Hedges, J.N. Job commitment in America: Is it waxing or waning? Monthly Labor Review, July 1983, 106, 17-24.
15. James, L.R., & Jones, A.P. Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction: An examination of reciprocal causation. Personnel Psychology, 1980, 33, 97-135.

16. Jones, A.P., James, L.R., & Bruni, J.R. Perceived leadership behavior and employee confidence in the leader as moderated by job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 146-149.
17. Kanter, R.M. Work in a new America. Daedalus, Winter, 1978, 107, 47-48.
18. Kanungo, R.N. Measurement of job and work involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1982, 67, 341-349.
19. Lawler, E.E., III, & Hall, D.T. Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 305-312.
20. Lodahl, T.M., & Kejner, M. The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 24-33.
21. Mannheim, B. A comparative study of work centrality, job rewards and satisfaction. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1975, 2, 79-102.
22. Morse, N.C., & Weiss, R.S. The function and meaning of work and the job. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 191-198.
23. Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1978.
24. Palmore, E. When can age, period, and cohort be separated? Social Forces, 1978, 57, 282-295.
25. Quinn, R.P., & Staines, G.L. The 1977 quality of employment survey. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1979.
26. Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D.T. Organizational research on job involvement. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 265-288.
27. Rabinowitz, S., Hall, D.T., & Goodale, J.G. Job scope and individual differences as predictors of job involvement: Independent or interactive? Academy of Management Journal, 1977, 20, 273-281.
28. Reitz, H.J., & Jewell, L.N. Sex, locus of control, and job involvement: A six-country investigation. Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 72-80.
29. Rhodes, S.R. Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 1983, 93, 328-367.
30. Saal, F.E. Job involvement: a multivariate approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 53-61.
31. Saleh, S.D., & Hosek, J. Job involvement: Concepts and measurements. Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 195-212.

32. Schwyhart, W.R., & Smith, P.C. Factors in the job involvement of middle managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 227-233.
33. Sheppard, H.L., & Herrick, N.Q. Where have all the robots gone? New York: Free Press, 1972.
34. Siegel, P.S. Prestige in the American occupational structure. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971.
35. Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
36. Stevens, J.M., Beyer, J.M., & Trice, H.M. Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21, 380-396.
37. Susman, G.I. Job enlargement: Effects on culture on worker responses. Industrial Relations, 1973, 12, 1-15.
38. Taylor, R.N., & Thompson, M. Work value systems of younger workers. Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 522-536.
39. Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1979, 52, 129-148.
40. Weissenberg, P., & Gruenfeld, L.W. Relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 469-473.
41. Wood, D.A. Effect of worker orientation differences on job attitude correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 54-60.
42. Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972.
43. Yankelovich, D. Work, values, and the new breed. In C. Keer and J.M. Rosow (Eds.), Work in America: The decade ahead. New York: Van Nostrand, 1979, 3-26.

Table 1
Studies Reporting a Relationship Between Age and Commitment to Work

Study	Description of Sample	Measure of Work Commitment Used	Relevant Findings
Morse & Weiss (1955)	Random sample of 401 employed men.	Q asking if R would continue working if he inherited enough money to live w/o working.	Up to age 65, a steady decline in reported willingness to work.
Lodahl & Kejner (1965)	137 nursing personnel.	20 item scale of job involvement.	Positive relationship reported between age and job involvement ($r = .26$; $p < .01$).
Schwyhart & Smith (1972)	149 middle managers drawn from a single company. A replication group of 58 drawn from four other companies. All respondents were under 40 years of age.	20 item Lodahl & Kejner scale.	In primary sample, JI significantly correlated with age ($r = .18$; $p < .05$). For the replication group, the relationship was not significant ($r = .16$; $p < .05$).
Susman (1973)	256 employees from 26 continuous process plants located in rural & urban settings.	A measure of pride in job accomplishment.	Pride in job accomplishment positively related to age ($p < .10$) in combined rural-urban sample and in combined rural-"transitional" sample ($p < .02$).

Table 1 (continued)

Studies Reporting a Relationship Between Age and Commitment to Work

Study	Description of Sample	Measure of Work Commitment Used	Relevant Findings
Aldag & Brief (1975)	131 hourly employees of a manufacturing firm.	8 item Blood (1969) Protestant ethic scale.	Significant correlation ($r = .305$; $p < .001$) between age and four item subscale measuring agreement with Protestant Ethic. No relationship between age and four item subscale measuring non-agreement with Protestant Ethic beliefs.
Hall & Mansfield (1975)	A group of 290 professional engineers & scientists chosen from representative R&D firms in state of CT. Some respondents were included as part of a second group interviewed 2 years later.	6 item subset of Lodahl & Kejner scale.	Significant correlation between age & JI in both larger sample ($r = .29$; $p < .01$) & smaller sample ($r = .40$; $p < .01$).
Jones, James & Bruni (1975)	123 employees of Army Corps of Engineers Office. Age range: 17 to 65. Average age: 38 years.	6 item subset of Lodahl & Kejner scale.	Significant correlation between age and job involvement ($r = .36$; $p < .01$).

Table 1 (continued)

Studies Reporting a Relationship Between Age and Commitment to Work

Study	Description of Sample	Measure of Work Commitment Used	Relevant Findings
Mannheim (1975)	Systematic sample of 778 urban Israeli males.	8 item measure of work role centrality based on previous work of Lodahl & Kejner (1965); Vroom (1962); Patchen (1970) & others.	No significant difference in scores on work role centrality between age groups.
Aldag & Brief (1977)	4 sub-samples: manufacturing operatives, hospital workers, correctional employees, and police officers. Total sample of 439.	2 items from the Lodahl & Kejner scale.	Significant relationship between age and job involvement in 3 of the 4 sub-samples ($r = .260, .402, .295$; $p < .05$).
Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale (1977)	332 employees of a Canadian provincial govt. ministry.	4 items from Lodahl & Kejner (1965) scale.	Age not significantly related to job involvement when entered into stepwise regression procedure with several other variables.
Saal (1978)	218 workers in a medium-sized manufacturing company.	Lodahl & Kejner 20 item scale.	Significant correlation between age & JI ($r = .34$; $p < .05$). Age also a significant predictor of JI in a stepwise regression procedure when combined with a set of personal-demographic variables.

Table 1 (continued)

Studies Reporting a Relationship Between Age and Commitment to Work

Study	Description of Sample	Measure of Work Commitment Used	Relevant Findings
Stevens, Beyer, & Trice (1978)	674 supervisors in 9 departments of the federal government.	A measure of job involvement. Number of items and source of items not reported.	A statistically significant relationship ($r = .177$; $p < .001$) between age and job involvement.
Cherrington, Condie & England (1979)	3053 workers in 53 companies.	Six measures taken from Survey of Work-Values (Wollack, et al., 1971); The Pro-Protestant ethic Scale (Blood, 1969); study of attitudes toward welfare (Goodwin, 1972) or formulated by the author.	Age was positively & significantly related to moral importance of work & pride in craftsmanship. And negatively & significantly related to importance of money, importance of friends over work and acceptability of welfare.
Reitz & Jewell (1979)	2882 industrial workers drawn from diverse worksites in 6 countries including the U.S.	A 45-item job involvement instrument.	Modest but statistically significant relationships ($r = .13$ to $r = .35$) between age and job involvement in 5 of the 6 countries.

Table 1 (continued)

Studies Reporting a Relationship Between Age and Commitment to Work

Study	Description of Sample	Measure of Work Commitment Used	Relevant Findings
Warr, Cook, & Wall (1979)	590 blue collar male workers within the mainland United Kingdom. Two samples combined.	A 6-item work involvement scale and a 6-item intrinsic job motivation scale. Several items in both scales are similar to Lodahl & Kejner items.	No relationship ($r = .04$) between age and work involvement. Weak but statistically significant relationship ($r = .17$; $p < .001$) between age and intrinsic job motivation.
Blumberg (1980)	54 coal miners, all male.	19 of the 20 items from the Lodahl & Kejner scale.	Significant relationship ($r = .40$; $p < .01$) between age and job involvement.
James & Jones (1980)	5 combined subsamples of non-supervisory personnel from 6 organizations. $N = 642$	5-item measure of job involvement based on Lodahl & Kejner items used by Lawler & Hall. Low reliability (coefficient $\alpha = .28$).	Statistically significant relationship ($r = .21$; $p < .01$) between age and job involvement.
Hammer, Landau, & Stern (1981)	112 nonsupervisory workers in a small manufacturing firm.	5-item job involvement scale not based on the Lodahl & Kejner items.	Statistically significant relationship ($r = .28$; $p < .01$) between age and job involvement.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix Between Measures of Commitment to Work

	JI	WRI	NE O	WE
Job Involvement	-	.187	.340	.274
Work Role Involvement		-	.238	.115
Non-Economic Orientation			-	.223
Work Effort				-

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables

	Sex	Age	Job Tenure	Prestige of Occupation	Income	Education	Job Sat
Sex	-	.046	.117	-.024	.429	-.020	-.042
Age		-	.500	.066	.207	-.161	.192
Job Tenure			-	.097	.345	-.074	.075
Prestige of Occupation				-	.319	.581	.163
Income					-	.267	.069
Education						-	.044
Job Sat							-

Sex 1 = male 0 = female

Table 4

Commitment to Work - By Age: Means and F-Values

Job Involvement	N	Mean	s.d.	F	
Under 25 years	236	2.68	.82	5.42 (DF = 4,1262)	P.< .001
25-34	380	2.78	.88		
35-44	252	2.84	.83		
45-54	212	2.98	.87		
55 or older	183	2.98	.80		
Work Role Involvement	N	Mean	s.d.	F	
Under 25 years	231	3.97	1.14	6.39 (DF = 5,1257)	P.< .001
25-34	378	3.93	1.22		
35-44	254	3.75	1.32		
45-54	210	3.64	1.36		
55-64	163	3.34	1.39		
65 or older	22	3.70	1.45		
Non-Economic Orientation	N	Mean	s.d.	F	
Under 25 years	235	2.82	1.11	2.06 (DF = 4,1241)	N.S.
25-34	373	3.00	1.15		
35-44	252	3.07	1.16		
45-54	204	3.08	1.10		
55 or older	178	3.01	1.01		
Work Effort	N	Mean	s.d.	F	
Under 25 years	239	3.32	.67	6.42 (DF = 4,1287)	P.< .001
25-34	386	3.50	.67		
35-44	256	3.63	.55		
45-54	218	3.45	.76		
55 or older	189	3.48	.77		

Table 5

Predictors of the Commitment to work
Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model

Proportion of variance in dependent variable (R^2) explained by:	Job Involvement	Work Role Involvement	Non-Economic Orientation	Work Effort
EQ ₁ X ₁ (income, education, seniority, prestige, sex)	.041	.047	.160	.014
EQ ₂ X ₁ + X ₂ (job satisfaction)	.112	.051	.238	.036
EQ ₃ X ₁ + X ₂ + X ₃ (age)	.114	.063	.238	.036
Increase in R^2 over EQ ₁ by adding X ₂	.071 F 1,1060 = 84.39**	.004 F 1,1060 = 3.72	.078 F 1,1060 = 108.54**	.022 F 1,1060 = 23.73**
Increase in R^2 over EQ ₂ by adding X ₃	.002 F 1,1059 = 1.79	.012 F 1,1059 = 14.12**	.000 F 1,1059 = 0.83	.000 F 1,1059 = 0.15

**p < .001

Standardized Regression Coefficients of Independent Variables^a

Income	-.010	-.101*	-.138*	.047
Education	.005	.068*	.144*	-.037
Seniority	.002	-.063*	-.025	.027
Prestige	.129*	.086*	.271*	.084*
Sex ^b	.104*	.123*	-.039	-.074*
Job Satisfaction	.263*	.077*	.280*	.135*
Age	.047	-.126*	.029	-.013

^aStatistical significance of coefficients computed by F-ratio with 6,1000 df.

^bPositive coefficient indicates higher ranking for men; negative coefficient indicates higher ranking for women.

*P < .01

APPENDIX A

Component Items of Commitment to Work Measures

Job Involvement

1. My main satisfaction in life comes from my work (strongly agree, disagree, agree, strongly agree).
2. How often do you think about your job when you're busy doing something else--often, sometimes, rarely, or never?
3. How much do you agree or disagree that the most important things that happen to you involve your job? (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree).

Work Role Involvement

1. I'd be happier if I didn't have to work at all (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree).
2. If you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you'd like for the rest of your life, would you continue to work? (yes, no).

Non-Economic Orientation to Work

1. What I do at work is more important to me than the money I earn (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree).
2. My main interest in my work is to get enough money to do the other things I want (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree).

Work Effort

1. ...how much effort do you put into your job beyond what is required--a lot, some, only a little, or none?